THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
JANUARY 23, 1976, IN THE FACULTY
CONFERENCE ROOM, SIXTH FLOOR
LISNER HALL

1 Provost Bright called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Present: President Elliott, Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtsbauer, Parliamentarian Schwartz, Adams, Birnbaum, Boswell, Cottrell, Fox, Griffith, Kirsch, Kurtz, Lilliefors, Morgan, Naeser, Nash, Pierpont, Purcell, Schiff, Schmidt, Smith, Stevenson, Vontress, and Wood.

Absent: Albert, Cassidy, C. Elliott, Grub, N. Kramer, R. Kramer, Liebowitz, Linton, Meltzer, Reich, Sapin, Solomon, Tillman, and Vaill.

2 The minutes of the December 12, 1975, meeting were approved as distributed.

Inasmuch as Professor Stevenson, Chairman, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee was detained, action on Item 3 on the agenda, reintroduction and further consideration of Resolution 73/7, was deferred for the time being and the Senate proceeded to Item 4.

4 Professor Adams, on behalf of the Physical Facilities Committee, explained that in response to President Elliott's recent rejection of Senate Resolution 74/10, "A Resolution on Campus Planning at The George Washington University," the committee was requesting guidance from the Senate as to the role of the Physical Facilities Committee since it had been assumed that its role was (1) to provide some sort of balance between aesthetic considerations and financial considerations in campus development and (2) to serve as a forum for faculty and student input with ideas, suggestions, and recommendations relating to campus development. With the rejection of Resolution 74/10, which reflected a modified version of Resolution 73/2, in which the committee thought its role had been explicitly defined in terms of these two objectives, Professor Adams said that the committee now found itself charged with what appeared to be a role concerned only with operational matters such as upkeep of blackboards and replacement of light bulbs, and for that reason the Physical Facilities Committee was coming back to the Senate to ask for further guidance on the matter.

Professor Cottrell said that he thought the situation of the Physical Facilities Committee was not dissimilar from that of a number of other Senate committees, and it was his recollection that some years ago a Review Committee had been established to deal with this problem giving some thought to a suggested reorganization of the committees. Professor Morgan said that a Faculty Organization Review Committee had recommended a significant restructuring of the Senate committees several years ago which, according to his recollection, the Faculty Senate favored and the Faculty Assembly rejected. He said that in regard to the concern Professor Adams raised about the role of the Physical Facilities Committee in light of the President's rejection of Resolution 74/10, which called for a specific kind of role for the committee, it appeared that there might be some dispute between members of the committee and perhaps the Senate and the Administration as to how formalized the review role of the Physical Facilities Committee should be.

President Elliott said he would like to comment on the problem raised by Professor Adams' committee since there was a long history involved in this matter, and he began his comments by referring to Paragraph 4 of Professor Adams' memorandum dated January 7, 1976, which states: "There is a rather angry group (The Committee for the Campus) which in a presentation to the Physical Facilities Committee indicated that they have no input to physical planning. Although this group has tried, at various levels of the administrative hierarchy, to obtain information or make recommendations they have been rebuffed or at least feel that they have been. The Physical Facilities Committee indicated that if given responsibility for contributing to policymaking, the Committee would serve as a convenient forum for collecting views from many sectors on-campus." President Elliott said that he suspected that the heart of the problem could be found within this context and that Professor Adams and her committee's evaluation of the mood of the Committee for the Campus was accurate; but that he would object to the statement that they have not had input, because he had heard them twice, once last year and once this year, in a rather complete and formal presentation, and a third time in an informal presentation to another group. He said that, in addition, Vice President Diehl and his associates had heard the committee's presentation a number of times; and it had been heard by two committees of the Board of Trustees as well. Therefore, the President said, the Committee for the Campus has been heard and its recommendations have been rejected, which may account in some measure for their dissatisfaction, compounded perhaps by differing interpretations of the words "input,""advisory,""consultation," and "participation in." All of these words, he said, were troubling these days because it seemed as though the use of them implies something that carries over into a decision-making responsibility even to the point of a veto power. President Elliott said it was his opinion that the role of the Physical Facilities Committee was "advisory" which did not necessarily mean "advice and consent."

The President then read the following paragraph from the Annual Report of the Physic Facilities Committee made to the Senate in May, 1970: "At the beginning of this academic year, Marcou, O'Leary and Associates, Planning and Urban Development Consultants, were appointed by the University to update and revise the University Long Range Campus Development Plan to meet the requirements of the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia and the National Planning Commission. At the committee's request to Vice President Hertzog, a presentation was made by Marcou, O'Leary and Associates on March 26, 1970, to the committee [the committee on Physical Facilities]. At the suggestion of the committee, a similar presentation will be made to the Senate at its May 8, 1970, meeting. This committee agrees with the recommended locations by Marcou, O'Leary and Associates for the Medical School, the Library and garage, and the overall concept of the campus development plan." President Elliott said that the Plan referred to in this Annual Report is still the Plan which is in effect and which is being challenged today, and that he would like to make it clear to the Senate that when that Plan was initially presented and heard by the Senate, it was approved by the Physical Facilities Committee, the committee of the Senate charged with that responsibility. The President said he did not believe a campus development plan would ever come which would satisfy all parties because everyone considers oneself an expert, either of a professional or amateur kind, on the financial, the aesthetic, the architectural, or the functional problems of campus development with the result that this is probably the most controversial aspect of university activity. The President said that he doubted very much if differences of opinion would ever be resolved to the point that they would disappear, but, as he saw it, the function of the Physical Facilities Committee was an advisory one, and he believed the administrative officers of the University were not only willing to have that advice, but eager to have it. However, he said, there was no guarantee that a particular recommendation or bit of advice would become policy simply because it came as a result of a committee's work.

Professor Nash said that he remembered the presentation and he recalled the Master Plan as being one which called for a building for every piece of land which, he gathered, was a ploy with the D. C. authorities to allow the University to build a building any place it wanted to by filling up the campus with big buildings. He said that this seemed to him to

be the source of the controversy since the Committee for the Campus had suggested an alternative plan with some scale to it that was less than totally filled with large buildings. Professor Nash said that he thought there were many people in the University community who would like to have some feeling that the administration was aware of their felt need to keep a human scale on the campus. He said that perhaps it was time to look at the Master Plan and attempt to find a middle ground between "filling the campus with big buildings" theory and "never tearing down another townhouse" theory, neither of which he strongly advocated. Professor Nash said he thought it was time to get off this dead center attitude and move toward some revisions of the Master Plan that would show people that there was an intention to keep some open space on the campus and maybe even an occasional townhouse somewhere.

Professor Fox said that he supported the President's statement because it appeared to him that the administration had proceeded in good faith by retaining qualified planners who were working in a logical fashion toward achieving the needs of the University and an aesthetic solution to those problems and needs. He said that it was his opinion, speaking as a civil engineer, that architects and planners, if anything, bend over backwards in considering the concerns of individuals and neighbors and he thought campus development really required experts to solve the problems.

President Elliott said that one question asked him very frequently is - Who speaks for the community? In this regard he said that the University has to answer to three formal boards now for every piece of building, new or old, which is changed in any fashion on this campus, and every proposal must clear these three groups before the University may proceed. Two of the groups - the National Capital Planning Commission and the Zoning Board - were in operation in 1970, and, he said, the third - the Fine Arts Committee - was added since 1970. These three groups are the official bodies charged with the responsibility of protecting the community; and, he added, to satisfy the requirements of those three groups was not an easy task.

Professor Adams stated that she did not want to see this issue become confused as a "student versus administration" issue because it was not that at all since the Physical Facilities Committee was composed of thirteen members, two of whom were students and three of whom were administrators in an ex officio capacity, and that the faculty had been working on this problem for a number of years prior to the students' presentation. In addition, Professor Adams said, the committee was not asking for an inordinate amount of input but simply for two things as reflected in Resolution 74/10 - (1) to be charged with the responsibility for a continuing review of the Master Plan through formal liaison with appropriate administrative officers and with faculty and students, and (2) to be advised, in writing, as far in advance as possible of any contemplated demolition, major exterior alterations of buildings or grounds, or change of land use within the campus, for the purpose of review and consideration by the committee. Unfortunately, Professor Adams said, the Physical Facilities Committee seldom finds itself in a position to advise the administration because the action has already taken place before the committee is aware of it, and, therefore, the committee was requesting that a formal liaison be established so that the committee could serve in an advisory function. President Elliott asked for a clarification of the meaning of "review" in that context because if the committee reviewed a proposal and did not agree with it, he did not know where that would leave the administration. Professor Adams responded that in her opinion "review" would mean that the committee had had an opportunity of knowing contemplated decisions with the responsibility of looking at such decisions and then giving its advice on the matters. The President said that when the Fine Arts Committee asked to review anything, its review included the authority to demand required changes, which was the other extreme of the same term used in the same context. By way of illustration, the President said that the demolition of the Tin Tabernacle had been known for a long time as part of the Master Plan, yet when it came time for the demolition to take place, there were five identifiable requests from academic parts of the University for the retention of the Tin Tabernacle. The President asked, "Must we review it again?" Professor Morgan asked the President if he

would have had any objection to a review by the Physical Facilities Committee if a decision had been made to alter the Master Plan by retaining the Tin Tabernacle rather than demolishing it as scheduled. The President responded that he would have no objection to the committee's making its recommendations in that event.

Professor Griffith said that he would like to address the specific issue before the Senate having to do with the process of consultation, advice, or participation in decision-making in a slightly broader fashion. He said that recently the Senate had elected a select committee to consult and work with the President and administrative officials on the matter of the objections which the President had raised to the proposed changes to the Code, and this relates to the President's rejection of Senate Resolution 74/12 which asked for greater participation in the planning and budgeting process. Professor Griffith said he would like to urge the select committee and the administration to try to find a constructive solution to the problem of the relationship between faculty--the Faculty Senate being in a position to have information and in a position to offer advice--and the administration's concern for their responsibilities to retain final authority under the Board of Trustees. He said that it seemed to him that it was possible that, with goodwill on both sides, a process could be worked out in which the desires of the faculty to have information in sufficient detail and with sufficient timeliness that it could react to it in a satisfactory way and not yet put the administration in the position of simply giving away all of its authority to reconcile the different areas of the University on matters which were of some controversy. Professor Griffith said that it was his view that some reasonable process of accommodation could be reached but the President's objection to Resolution 74/12 did not offer any kind of inbetween stage, but only some vague remarks in the supporting deans' memorandum about continuing to develop and use fully various planning processes and continuing to solicit faculty advice. He said that this was a matter of considerable importance and that he thought there should b developed in an explicit way a fairly full understanding of what the various roles are and where the faculty's prerogatives to advise end and where the administration's responsibility to make a final decision begins. He recalled the President's remarks made to the ill-fated All-University Assembly Steering Committee in December, 1972, when he said that the governance of the University was generally characterized by consensus; but, Professor Griffith, said it was his own impression that by and large consensus stopped at the budget line, and he thought he saw that reflected in the President's rejection of the Physical Facilities Committee's Resolution 74/10. He said that he thought some accommodation would have to be reached and if it was not, then he thought it would be up to individual members of the Senate, and perhaps the Senate itself, to rethink the basis of its cooperation in this crucial area.

President Elliott said that he felt compelled to respond to Professor Griffith's comments because it seemed to him that the two areas of the University's activities in which accommodation was being sought were areas which had heretofore been clearly identified as administrative responsibilities, whereas no accommodation was being sought in areas which had previously been predominantly faculty responsibility. He said that this is a line which has to be examined very clearly because most of the substantive proposals for changes in the Code and Ordinances have to do with reaching an accommodation in the other areas, without any reference to the areas in which the University faculty or its school or college components already exercise full authority, such as academic personnel, appointment, retention, promotion, academic programs, learning and teaching, and research. The President said he would like to mention that it was not too long ago that the administration and faculty, through appropriate mechanisms, shared those responsibilities, but that the pendulum now seems to have moved very far to the other side to the point where appropriately, candidly and factually, we can say that the admission of students, what students do when they are here, and how students leave the University, are matters of concern to the faculty only. The President said he would

invite the Senate's serious attention to this ongoing division and would also invite its serious consideration of the accommodations which may be mutually beneficial to the institution, as well as to the office, or the person, or the group--whether it be administrative officers, faculty members, or both.

Responding to the President, Professor Griffith said that, although the President perhaps saw curricular responsibility as entirely within the responsibility of the faculty, it was significant to note that part of the Code and Ordinances revisions objected to by the President speaks of the desirability of planning and budgeting and curriculum responsibilities. He said that it seemed fairly clear that from the standpoint of the faculty the responsibility for electing someone to an open position was very significantly influenced by the question of whether or not there is an open position to fill, and if the authority for determining whether or not vacancies are to be filled was entirely an administrative prerogative, then that would appear to significantly affect the responsibility in the area of curricular development and planning of educational programs. He said that he did not wish to argue that the faculty's right to have information necessarily implied the full authority to decide, but he thought it was clear that there has to be some consideration on both sides and perhaps this represented a very different perception of the responsibilities of the faculty. Professor Griffith concluded by saying that, while there may be a traditional notion of a clear line between administrative and faculty responsibilities, there may also be a very strong difference in perception of how clear that line is or where it is understood to lie.

Further discussion followed by Professors Schiff, Adams, Fox, and President Elliott. Professor Nash said that he thought it was most unfortunate to view the future governance of the University as an adversary affair between the administration and faculty where a line has been drawn, each knows who owns which part of the turf, and that that is the ultimate resolution of the matter. He said he would suggest that curriculum, personnel, and budget are not opposites that can be placed on two sides of a line and successfully run a university. Professor Morgan said that it seemed to him that many of the Senate committees might give some attention to what their roles are and the proper relationship between the committees and the relevant administrative officials with whom they consult. He said that in his opinion the Physical Facilities Committee and any of the other Senate committees had a responsibility to solicit and gather what information they needed for the examination of matters within their competence and to make recommendations. Professor Morgan said he had a great deal of confidence in the ability of the administration to listen to those recommendations and to accept some of them and to reject others with good reason that probably could be explained in most instances in a manner that would make perfectly good sense to the Senate. However, Professor Morgan said, it seemed to him that the committees were well-advised to bring their recommendations to the Senate for discussion because long experience has shown that what may seem clear to a particular committee was not always seen in the same light by the Senate. President Elliott said that he would like to reiterate earlier what he had said and that was, as a member of the administration, he welcomed the advice of the respective committees of the Senate but that the only point he had tried to make was one which he felt bound to make--that anyone or any group who gives advice must be prepared for the times when that advice simply cannot be adopted and made official policy, and with that kind of restriction and understanding, the President said he did not see any reason why the faculty and administration could not continue to work as they have. Professor Adams said that she, too, did not like to operate in an adversarial position, the way it appeared that the Physical Facilities Committee has had to operate the past few years, and she said that if the Faculty Senate permitted this issue to slide by with a few very moral recommendations, then she thought that the Senate was overlooking not only the role of the Physical Facilities Committee but also the role of the Faculty Senate. President Elliott said that in the best interests of the University, there were some matters which could not be handled by a committee, whether it be a Faculty Senate Committee or a committee of any other group. To illustrate the point,

he said that recently the Board of Trustees authorized the purchase of a piece of property within the boundaries of the campus which the University had been negotiating for for some four or five years. When the opportunity to purchase this property by the University presented itself a few weeks ago, it required swift action on the part of the University to complete the transaction. He said that this was a matter which could not be negotiated publicly, and only one or two officers of the administration, acting on behalf of the University, could have completed the action. The President said that he thought Professor Adams had a perfect right to say that her committee could not make recommendations because it did not know what actions were being taken until too late, but he said that the action he had just described was not, in his opinion, detrimental to the University, nor did the Board of Trustees think so, some of whom were intimately familiar with this particular matter.

3 The Senate returned to Item 3, reintroduction and further consideration of Resolution 73/7, "A Resolution Approving Revisions to the Faculty Code and Ordinances." Professor Stevenson, on behalf of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, reported on the progress of the select committee's meeting with the President and other administrative officials with regard to certain objections raised by the President to the present draft of the Code Revision. He said that the committee had met for two entire afternoons, with another meeting scheduled February 6th; that the discussions had been productive thus far; and that he thought the select committee might be able to finish its work at the next meeting. In the meantime Professor Stevenson said that he thought the work of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee and action by the Senate on amendments to the Code should be suspended until the select committee had actually completed its work, and, therefore, he was withdrawing the proposed amendment to the grievance procedure section of the Code Revision, as circulated with the Agenda, for introduction at a later date. Professor Stevenson said he would return the proposed amendment to the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee for reconsideration in light of Professor Cassidy's proposal regarding revision of the grievance procedure which the Committee might wish to adopt instead. Professor Pie nt asked Professor Stevenson if he could indicate when final action by the Senate on the Code Revision might be expected since the February Senate meeting would mark the end of the current session. Professor Stevenson said that it might be possible to finish the work on the Code Revision at the February meeting although there would be a large number of proposed amendments offered which he would try to distribute to the Senate before that meeting, and he urged members to study them carefully so that the Senate would be prepared to act on them.

5 Professor Morgan, on behalf of the Executive Committee, recommended the following nominees for election to the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 1976-77 Session: Ralph C. Nash, Jr., Temporary Chairman (Law); Raymond R. Fox (Engineering); Frederick C. Kurtz (SGBA); Charles R. Naeser (Columbian); Howard C. Pierpont (Medical); John P. Reesing, Jr. (Columbian); and Clemmont E. Vontress (Education). There were no nominations from the floor and the slate was elected unanimously.

6 Under Brief Statements Professor Morgan said that he had three items to report. First, he reminded members that annual reports from the several committees were due at the February meeting. Secondly, he said that he had been asked by the Development Office and by Associate Dean Jensen to announce that the 1976 "George Calling Telethon" would begin Tuesday, February 17th, proceeding Monday through Thursday thereafter from 7 p.m.-9:30 p.m.through Thursday, March 11th. Professor Morgan said that participation by faculty, students, and staff was invited, and that last year the telethon was responsible for raising approximately $100,000 and he wished to point out that the staff of one division of the University, the College of General Studies, participated last year to the extent of 85% of their personnel and this year they had reserved two full nights for participation in the telethon. Professor Morgan urged the support of the faculty in this endeavor and invited anyone interested in volunteering to call the Development Office, Ext. 6415. The third item, Professor Morgan said, was a repo on the status of the De Pauw matter. He said that the Executive Committee had been informed that the matter would be considered by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees and that action would be taken by the Board at its March meeting; he said he had not been informed as to what action would be taken.

Professor Schmidt said he would like to make three brief remarks - the first one concerning the Library Committee's responsibility to encourage all department library representatives to consider carefully how funds were being spent because by the middle of February the Librarian would be redistributing funds to those departments claiming serious shortages. Secondly, Professor Schmidt said that a proposal for negotiation was in process between the Library and the University for the possible acquisition of a very large collection from the Pan American Union which would have a rather large impact in terms of responsibility for the University. A matter of this importance, he thought, would necessitate the advice of faculty and the Senate. Thirdly, Professor Schmidt said that he agreed with the point raised by Professor Morgan that the Senate committees should first present their recommendations on matters to the Senate before those recommendations were implemented. Professor Morgan said that he had merely wished to stress the fact that approval of a Senate committee was not necessarily approval of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Griffith remarked briefly about the question of committee structure and committee annual reports. He said that it has been his experience as chairman of various Senate committees that the present Senate schedule made it very difficult to get any substantial work done and to report by the middle of February, and he urged that the new Executive Committee consider the possibility of either restructuring the term of the Senate or stabilizing the membership of the standing committees over a two year period. Professor Pierpont said that one mechanism which a committee could use if its work could not be completed during the session was to state that fact in its annual report whereby it would become a matter for continuing action by the subsequent committee.

7 Provost Bright adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m. upon motion made and seconded.

Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate January 12, 1976

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, January 23, 1976, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room on the sixth floor of Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Minutes of the regular meeting of December 12, 1975

3. Old Business:

 Reintroduction and further consideration of Resolution 73/7, "A RESOLUTION APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE FACULTY CODE AND ORDINANCES," Professor Russell B. Stevenson, Jr., Chairman, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee (see attached proposed amendment to Faculty Grievance Procedures submitted by Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee)

4. Reports:

 Consideration of a request from Professor Elizabeth B. Adams, Chairman of the Physical Facilities Committee, concerning Resolution 74/10, " A RESOLUTION ON CAMPUS PLANNING AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY" (see attached memorandum submitted by Physical Facilities Committee)

5. General Business:

 Nomination for election of the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 1976-77 Session: Ralph C. Nash, Jr., Temporary Chairman (Law); Raymond R. Fox (Engineering); Frederick C. Kurtz (SGBA); Charles R. Naeser (Columbian); Howard C. Pierpont (Medical); John P. Reesing, Jr. (Columbian); and Clemmont E. Vontress (Education)

6. Brief Statements

7. Adjournment

Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Russell Stevenson, Chairman of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

RE: Code Revision - Faculty Grievance Procedures

DATE: December 11, 1975

The Committee recommends the following changes in the proposed revision of the Code:

1. In the amendment adopted on October 10, 1975, in section F.2. b)(1) (page 2), change "Hearing Committee of five members" to "Hearing Committee of three members."

2. In section F.2. b) (4) (page 3), change "all five members of the Committee" to "all three members of the Committee."

3. In section F.2. c)(8) (page 4), strike the second sentence and add, "The report shall be filed with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and copies shall be sent to each of the parties."

4. Strike paragraph F.3. (page 4) in its entirety and replace it by:

"3. Appeals

a) Any party may appeal the Hearing Committee's decision by filing a notice of appeal with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate within ten days of the filing of the Hearing Committee's report.

b) Appeals shall be heard by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

c) The parties to an appeal may, at the discretion of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, present written and oral argument in accordance with a schedule established by the Committee.

d) On conclusion of the appeal proceedings, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom may affirm, reverse or modify the decision of the Hearing Committee or may remand the case for further proceedings. It shall do so by written opinion, copies of which shall be filed with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and sent to each of the parties.

"4. Disposition

a) When a final determination has been reached, the report of the Hearing Committee and the decision of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, if any, shall be forwarded to the President of the University for appropriate action."

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

School of Government and Business Administration / Department of Management Science

Room 201
710 Twenty-First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 676-7375

January 7, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: Professor John A. Morgan, Jr.
Chairman, Executive Committee
Faculty Senate

FROM: Elizabeth Byrne Adams
Chairman, Physical Facilities Committee

RE: Resolution 74/10 and Response

As you know, there are many people on the Physical Facilities Committee who have been closely involved with Resolution 74/10 and its predecessor Resolution 73/2. (Each of these are attached as are the two rejections by President Elliott.) For these individuals, particularly, President Elliott's memorandum of December 2, 1975 was a bitter disappointment. I shall attempt to explain some of the sentiments expressed when we discussed the aforementioned memorandum.

1. Resolution 74/10 was a mild, "watered-down" resolution wherein an attempt was made to comply with the objections expressed in President Elliott's letter to Professor Stevenson dated September 30, 1974. Therefore, the second rejection was not anticipated.

2. Without a resolution which permits the Physical Facilities Committee to participate in policymaking, the Committee may be involved only in operational matters such as poor blackboards, missing light bulbs etc.

3. The Committee unamimously expressed the thought that campus development should be based on financial as well as aesthetic considerations and that the Faculty and students should have some input on aesthetic considerations.

4. There is a rather angry group (The Committee for the Campus) which in a presentation to the Physical Facilities Committee indicated that they have no input to physical planning. (Their presentation is attached.) Although this group has tried, at various levels of the administrative hierarchy, to obtain information or make

recommendations, they have been rebuffed or at least feel that they have been. The Physical Facilities Committee indicated that if given responsibility for contributing to policymaking, the Committee would serve as a convenient forum for collecting views from many sectors on-campus.

5. Without the resolution, it was difficult for the Committee to perceive a reason for its existence.

6. Finally, the Committee determined that since it was a Committee of the Faculty Senate, it should solicit the assistance of the Senate. The Committee was reminded that the Faculty Senate had unanimously supported Resolution 73/2 and 74/10. (Minutes attached)

We look forward to a response from the Faculty Senate concerning appropriate steps which may be taken now; whether the Senate is concerned that these be taken; and the Senate's perception of the future role of the Physical Facilities Committee.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

FACULTY SENATE

January 15, 1976

TO: Members of the University Faculty Assembly

FROM: John A. Morgan, Jr., Chairman, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

The current Faculty Organization Plan for The George Washington University charges the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to "nominate the members and chairmen of the standing and special committees" of the Faculty Senate. The newly-elected Executive Committee for Senate Session 1976-77 and the incumbent Executive Committee make these nominations at a combined meeting in February 1976.

I urge each member of the Faculty Assembly to consider seriously his or her responsibilities for volunteering service on one of the following committees during 1976-77. Please supply the appropriate information below and return to Doris Trone, Senate Office, Rice Hall, 1st Floor, by February 15, 1976:

Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty
Admissions and Advanced Standing
Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
Athletics
Educational Policy
Fiscal Planning and Budgeting
Library
Physical Facilities
Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
Public Ceremonies
Research
Student Financial Aid
University Development and Resources
University Objectives
University and Urban Affairs
Joint Committee of Faculty and Students

Name _____ Department _____ Rank _____
Length of service in the University: Years _____
Service as a member of the Senate: Dates _____
Service on Senate Committees:
Name(s) of committee(s) and dates:

_____ _____

I should like to serve on a Senate Committee within the time limitation noted below. I prefer service on one of the following committees:

(1st choice) _____

(2nd choice) _____

(3rd choice) _____

I will be available for committee work only during the regular academic year _____

I will also be available for committee work during at least one of the summer sessions _____

I prefer not to serve during 1976-77 _____

Please make any additional comments on the back of this sheet.